DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 746 SP 033 615

AUTHOR Whooley, John E.
TITLE Enhancing the Scholarship of Teaching: Who Should Lead?
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (San Antonio, TX, February 25-28, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Educational Improvement; Excellence in Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Leadership Responsibility; *Researchers; Scholarship; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Educator Education; *Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine a campus-wide service activity, provided by School of Education faculty and administration. The program described aims to enhance student development by improving teaching across the university campus. University faculties are challenged to extend the mission of schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs) to serve the teaching needs of university faculty members who are established research scholars but have had little opportunity to develop the scholarship of teaching. SCDEs are encouraged to provide leadership for the improvement of instruction at the university level. A 24-hour workshop for university faculty approaches instruction as a direct, systematic process acknowledging the art of teaching while emphasizing the knowledge that undergirds it. The workshop has three areas of emphasis: (1) planning learning outcomes; (2) helping ensure learner success; and (3) evaluating both learning and teaching. The importance of learner development, thinking skills, and evaluation strategies of learning outcomes at varied levels of cognitive functioning are stressed. Participant follow-up studies indicate that respondents find the workshop has helped them to better plan instruction, carry out instruction, evaluate learner achievement, and evaluate their own instruction. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342746

ENHANCING THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING: WHO SHOULD LEAD?

A paper presented at the

1992 Annual Meeting

of the

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

San Antonio, Texas

by

Dr. John E. (Jack) Whooley, Associate Dean
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Whooley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033615

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Enhancing the Scholarship of Teaching: Who Should Lead?

This study presents an example of leadership provided by School of Education faculty and administration in a campus-wide service activity. The program described aims at enhancing student development by improving teaching across the university campus. It challenges university faculties and administrations to extend the mission of schools, colleges, or departments of Education (SCDEs) to serve the teaching needs of university faculty members who are established research scholars, but who have had little opportunity to develop the scholarship of teaching. Ernest Boyer (1990) proposes in his treatment of scholarship, that "the work of the professional might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching."

The extension of mission mentioned above encourages SCDEs to provide leadership for the improvement of instruction at the university level. Peterson and Comeaux (1989) discussing the professional knowledge of the reflective teacher quote Shulman's (1987) perception of the seven domains of teachers' knowledge. In addition to content or subject matter knowledge, the domains include general pedagogy, curriculum, content pedagogy, the learner, educational context, and educational purposes, outcomes and values. Faculties and administrations of SCDEs willing to assume leadership must be proficient and willing to share with content specialists much of the knowledge in the domains delineated by Shulman. Universities concerned with encouraging the scholarship of teaching should be able to turn to SCDEs for leadership in that endeavor.

The presence of exemplary teaching across the curricula must be of special importance to SCDEs. General education courses taken and academic majors and minors pursued by prospective teachers are taught generally by faculty educated to be researchers - not teachers. The notion that "teachers will teach as they have been taught", should cause SCDEs to want to share their expertise to help scholars from the various disciplines become better teaching models. "....Whether they like it or not, university and college teachers in the disciplines are teacher educators," according to Shulman (1987). And Meserve (1988) noted that, "....Instructors who teach any course for prospective teachers must themselves be expert in the art and craft of teaching."

The program described in this session has been in place for seven years. It is staffed by a School of Education faculty member whose time is underwritten by the Dean of the school. It is promoted through the School of Graduate Studies and Research, the institutional center for all faculty development

activities. The university's Vice Chancellor invites faculty annually to voluntary participation in the program. Faculty and staff members from 34 areas in the School of Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, and Nursing as well as from instructional service areas have participated in the program.

The 24 hour workshop approaches instruction as a direct, systematic process acknowledging the art of teaching but emphasizing the knowledge that undergirds it. The workshop has three areas of emphases: planning learning outcomes, helping ensure learner success, and evaluating both learning and teaching. It stresses the importance of learner development. Developing thinking skills is encouraged by relating instructing and evaluating strategies to learning outcomes at varied levels of cognitive functioning.

A participant follow-up study was conducted in the Fall of 1989. Respondents (N=40) indicated that participation in the workshop helped them better plan instruction (93%), carry out instruction (90%), evaluate learner achievement (95%) and evaluate their own instruction (95%). One person noted that the workshop was the most effective thing done in his/her teaching career to improve teaching effectivess, and that there had been a significant improvement in student evaluations as a result of the program. Following the Spring, 1991 workshop a participant's evaluation stated, "This has been the most valuable gift I have received as a faculty member at this institution. I have come away from these Monday afternoon sessions refreshed, renewed, and remembering what I am here to do first and foremost: teach."

se37

ENHANCING THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING: WHO SHOULD LEAD?

Ernest Boyer (1990) has challenged academicians to reconsider the concept of scholarship. He says that the present interpretation of the concept and the associated reward structure negatively effect the teaching function in comprehensive colleges and universities. His description of the evolution of the scholarship concept in American higher education, from an emphasis on teaching and the undergraduate student, to service, and to basic research, graduate education and the professoriate, provides sufficient reason to reconsider the concept, and the associated functions of scholars. Boyer notes:

> We conclude that for America's colleges and universities to remain vital a new vision of scholarship is required. What we are faced with, today, is the need to clarify campus missions and relate the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life. **We need especially to ask how institutional diversity can be strengthened and how the rich array of faculty talent in our colleges and universities might be more effectively used and continuously renewed.** (boldface added) We proceed with the conviction that if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered.

What does scholarship mean? What are the functions of the scholar? Boyer states, "We conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions; the scholarship of **discovery;** the scholarship of **integration;** the scholarship of **application;** and the scholarship of **teaching.**" He proposes a definition of scholarship that incorporates disciplined inquiry; interpretation, synthesis and perspective; problem solving; and the transforming, transmission, and extending of knowledge. Boyer's inclusion of teaching as an essential function of scholarship contains important implications for SCDs of Education that extend to status, mission and achievement.

STATUS:

SCDs of Education do not enjoy status on many campuses, and the associated faculty are often considered second-rate citizens. This is explainable in terms of the current definition of scholarship that extols research and publication and minimizes the significance of teaching. Status should be enhanced on campuses that include the function of teaching in their operational definition of scholarship, especially when the SCDs of Education provide leadership to enhance that function on the campuses.

MISSION:

A definition of scholarship that includes the function of teaching should justify extending the mission of SCDs of Education to college and university

campuses. Presently, the essential mission of SCDs is to foster teaching scholarship in the common schools. Extending that mission to include higher education is logically appropriate.

Most college and university scholars are concerned primarily with their disciplines, having been prepared as researchers rather than as teachers. The hiring institution should provide them opportunity to enhance their teaching scholarship out of concern for the well-being of the scholars, students, and society. No other segment of the higher education institution should be better prepared to assist in carrying out this service to faculty than SCDs of Education whose faculties should be responsible at least for integrating and making application of what is known about teaching and learning.

Shulman's (1987) list of the seven domains of knowledge important to teaching support the appropriateness of extending the mission to enhance teaching scholarship at colleges and universities.

- content knowledge or understanding of the subject matter
- general pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter
- curriculum knowledge, with particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as "tools of the trade" for teachers
- pedagogical content knowledge, that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding
- knowledge of learners and their characteristics
- knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of communities and cultures
- knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.

Excepting the content knowledge, the domains essentially describe the curriculum of SCDs of Education, especially in those institutions where faculty members have joint appointments to both an academic discipline department and a pedagogy department.

ACHIEVEMENT:

Successful implementation of the extended mission should result in developing better teachers for the common schools. Presently much of the preparation of teachers is provided by faculty not trained as teachers, and therefore not prepared to be the most effective teaching role models. Students with majors or minors in academic disciplines, often have as role models faculty well prepared as researchers but not as teachers. If their teaching scholarship would be enhanced through the successful implementation of the extended

mission, the preparation of prospective teachers could be improved. Merserve (1988) indicated:

> The undergraduate curriculum needs to be revised so that future teachers can study the subjects they will teach with instructors who model fine teaching and who understand the pedagogy of their material....**Instructors who teach any courses for prospective teachers must themselves be expert in the art and craft of teaching.** (boldface added)

The School of Arts & Sciences faculty predominate the preparation of prospective teachers in the elementary-middle and middle-secondary preparation programs at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. The minimum 143 semester credit elementary-middle program generally includes 90 credits of work in Arts and Sciences courses, 63% of the required credits. The minimum 151 semester credits in the secondary-middle program typically includes 109 credits of work in Arts and Sciences courses, 72% of the required credits. In the first instance, School of Arts and Sciences faculty provide approximately 2 credits of instruction for every 1 credit provided by School of Education faculty; the ratio is approximately 3 to 1 in the latter program. Shulman noted:

> One of the things that comes out very clearly in the intellectual biographies of our students is the enormous influence content course teachers have on students' conception of teaching. **Whether they like it or not, university and college teachers in the disciplines are teacher educators** (boldface added). They are educating future teachers every time they represent their subject in a particular way, every time they either do or do not make the evaluations they conduct compatible with the goals of the instruction in which they engage, every time they present their pedagogy in a particular way.

SCDs of Education that accept the challenge of providing leadership for enhancing the teaching dimension of scholarship in higher education will be making an important contribution to improving that scholarship in the common schools.

EXEMPLIFICATION:

The program described below has been in place for seven years. It was initiated through the School of Education and is staffed one semester each year by a School of Education faculty member whose time is underwritten by the Dean of that school. It is promoted through the School of Graduate Studies and Research, the institutional center for all faculty development activities. The university's Vice Chancellor invites faculty annually to voluntary participation in the program. Faculty and academic staff members from the following 35 departments in the Schools of Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, and instructional service areas and from the School of Nursing have participated in the study:

Academic Advising	Economics	Nursing
Academic Computing	Elementary Education	Physical Education

Accountancy	French	Physics
Allied Health	Geography	Political Science
Art	Geology	Psychology
Biology	History	Religion
Business Administration	Library Science	School Evaluation Consortium
Business Education	Library Services	Social Work
Chemistry	Management Info.Systems	Spanish
Comm. Disorders	Mathematics	Special Education
Comm/Theatre Arts	Media Development	Speech
Computer Science	Music	

The 24 hour workshop approaches instruction as a direct, systematic process, recognizing and encouraging the art of teaching but emphasizing its science. The program has three areas of emphasis: formulating instructional targets, employing appropriate evaluation procedures and helping ensure learner success. Exploration of those areas is preceded by a discussion of underlying tenets relating practices to beliefs, acknowledging the diversity of positions, encouraging introspection philosophically, and providing participants opportunity to critique the assumptions undergirding the workshop. It stresses the importance of learner development, minimizes the emphasis on teacher activities, and promotes maximum learner development as opposed to sorting out learners, when addressing the question of the university's basic function.

The program initially focuses on the importance of instructional objectives specified in terms of learner development. These outcomes provide direction to the teacher in making subject matter, instructing and evaluating decisions, and to the learner in making study decisions. Developing learners' thinking skills is encouraged by relating objectives to the levels of the cognitive taxonomy and to classroom questioning strategies.

The second part of the program emphasizes alignment of evaluation procedures with the objectives. It examines the common characteristics of educational evaluation, and the essential qualities associated with evaluation instruments, procedures, and performance interpretation. It considers means to help ensure quality assessment procedures emphasizing blueprinting when preparing written examinations. Principles of test construction and problems of grading are explored.

Consistent with the philosophy that universities should foster the maximum development of students, participants consider means of ensuring learner success. These include orienting learners to courses, establishing an environment conducive to learning, planning instruction systematically, applying basic learning principles, and employing self-assessment to enhance teaching effectiveness.

The university office responsible for faculty inservice activities carried out a workshop participant follow-up study. Fifty-five participants were asked to respond to four questions relating closely to the essential components of the program. Comments were invited for each question. Forty (73%) of the participants returned usable responses. The questions and responses follow:

Did participation in the workshop help you better:

	yes		no		omit	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. plan instruction	37	93	3	07	-	-
b. carry out instruction	36	90	2	05	2	05
c. evaluate learner achieve.	38	95	2	05	-	-
d. evaluate your instruction	38	95	2	05	-	-

Though comments varied, participants did regard the definition of instructional objectives as helpful to planning. Some indicated the value of establishing outcomes for focusing their instruction. The relationship of testing to objectives was clear. The systematic approach to instruction was seen as providing a usable framework for instructional self-assessment. Some enjoyed the opportunity to discuss instructing with members of other departments. One person noted that the workshop was the most effective thing done in her/his teaching career to improve teaching skills and effectiveness, and that there had been a significant improvement in student evaluations as a result of the program. Several faculty recommended the program to peers, others indicated that they felt it should be mandatory for faculty. Apart from the evaluation activity, one participant suggested to a school Dean that participation in the program be a condition for extra-merit salary increases. Another indicated that the workshop was the nicest gift received from the University.

The above example is intended only to demonstrate that a SCD of Education can provide leadership to the enhancement of the teaching dimension of scholarship on a college university campus.

CONCLUSION:

Where are we going? Who will lead us there? Boyer's approach to scholarship provides an exciting stimulus to reexamine and extend the mission of SCDs of Education. The extension of that mission to include the enhancement of teaching scholarship on a higher education campus is a logically appropriate extension of the mission commonly assigned. No division of a college/university community should be better prepared to help that community improve teaching scholarship than a qualified SCD of Education. The critical question is whether or not given the opportunity for a campus leadership role in enhancing the scholarship of teaching, SCDs of Education will be willing and able to carry out the challenge. Enhanced status of SCDs of Education, improved instruction in colleges and universities, and better prepared teachers for our common schools are potential rewards for exercising that initiative.

REFERENCES

1) Boyer, Ernest L. (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, N.J.

2) Merserve, Bruce E. (1988). "Mathematicians Endorse Holmes Curriculum and Teaching Goals." The Holmes Group Forum II:24.

3) Peterson, Penelope L., Comeaux, Michelle A. "Assessing the Teacher as Reflective Professional: New Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation." Research Perspectives on the Graduate Preparation of Teachers. Ed. Anita E. Woolfolk. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1989.

4) Shulman, L.S. (1987). "Knowledge & Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform." Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

5) Shulman, Lee S. "Learning to Teach." American Association for Higher Education Bulletin 40:3 (1987): 5-9.

se46